

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

WESLEY TODD FITTRO,)
Plaintiff,)
vs.)
DR. JASON WILKENS, DR. USSER) Case No. 6:19-cv-03055-MDH
and DR. WALKER,)
Defendants.)

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Pro Se Motion for Contempt and Motion to Reopen (Doc. 52); Second Motion to Reopen, Motion for Contempt, and Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Doc. 53); Motion to Reopen (Doc. 54); Motion to Compel and Motion for Judgment (Doc. 55); and Motion to Strike (Doc. 57) ("Plaintiff's Motions"). Plaintiff's Motions stem from an incident where he alleged negligent medical care while detained at the Greene County Jail. This Court dismissed Plaintiff's complaint against Defendant Wilkens in June 2019 for failure to comply with RSMo. § 538.225.6. (Doc. 20). This Court dismissed the remaining defendants in January 2020 for Plaintiff's failure to comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). (Doc. 23). Since dismissal, Plaintiff has filed various pro se motions, all denied. This Court previously held Plaintiff in contempt, stemming from an incident where Plaintiff emailed court staff more than 200 times and failed to appear for a contempt hearing.

Plaintiff's Pro Se Motion for Contempt and Motion to Reopen (Doc. 52) appears to allege Greene County Sheriff's Department failed to accept service for Defendant Wilkens. This Court,

however, dismissed Plaintiff's action against Defendant Wilkens for failure to file an affidavit as RSMo. § 538.225.6 requires. The remaining motions consist largely of Bible verses and conclusory allegations. Plaintiff's Second Motion to Reopen, Motion for Contempt, and Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Doc. 53) requests this Court fine several people and hold them in contempt, but Plaintiff fails to state any basis for this request. Plaintiff's Motion to Reopen (Doc. 54) appears to allege someone unlawfully changed Plaintiff's address, but Plaintiff fails to specify how this relates to his request to reopen a case. Plaintiff labels Document 55 Motion to Compel and Motion for Judgment, but Plaintiff simply makes more conclusory allegations with insufficient specificity to discern the nature of Plaintiff's claims. Plaintiff labels Document 57 Motion to Strike, but requests from this Court either reopening the case, appointment of counsel, or a judgment in full. The substance of Plaintiff's Motion to Strike, however, amounts to complaints about various individuals and organizations. Plaintiff fails to allege any facts that would allow this Court to grant any of Plaintiff's specific requests.

Because Plaintiff has failed to advance any legal or factual arguments, Plaintiff's Pro Se Motion for Contempt and Motion to Reopen (Doc. 52); Second Motion to Reopen, Motion for Contempt, and Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Doc. 53); Motion to Reopen (Doc. 54); Motion to Compel and Motion for Judgment (Doc. 55); and Motion to Strike (Doc. 57) are all **DENIED.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 12, 2022

/s/ Douglas Harpool
DOUGLAS HARPOOL
United States District Judge